



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/654,857	09/05/2000	Marc Lamberton	FR9-1999-0061US1	8194

45211 7590 04/28/2005  
KELLY K. KORDZIK  
WINSTEAD SECHREST & MINICK PC  
PO BOX 50784  
DALLAS, TX 75201

EXAMINER

ZHONG, CHAD

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2152

DATE MAILED: 04/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/654,857

Applicant(s)

LAMBERTON ET AL.

Examiner

Chad Zhong

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 December 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 06 July 2004 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

**FINAL ACTION**

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment, filed on 12/13/2004. This action has been made final.

2. Claims 1-15 are presented for examination. In amendment B, filed on 12/13/2004: claims 1, 4, 6, 11 are amended.

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:  
It is not clearly indicated where [356] exists on the figures (pg 11, line 26); Appropriate correction is required. Examiner did not receive a copy of this figure.

Applicant's remarks filed 12/13/04 have been considered but are found not persuasive in view at the new grounds at rejection necessitated by Applicant's amendment.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

14. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371 (c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

5. Claims 1, 2, 6, 11, 7, 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Tso et al. (hereinafter Tso), US 6,421,733.

6. As per claim 1, Tso teaches a client-server environment, a method for providing transparency in a gateway of an IP network comprising the steps of:

interrogating a directory comprising proxy server protocol data for each end-user of said IP network (Col. 6, lines 10-20; Col. 7, lines 25-30; Col. 9, lines 25-30; Col. 10, lines 1-15);

retrieving parameters associated with a proxy server protocol data for a first end-user in response to an access request from a client application of said first end-user (Col. 6, lines 10-20).

accessing an application server on behalf of said client application in accordance with said retrieved parameters for said first end-user (Col. 6, lines 10-20, lines 60-67; Col. 7, lines 25-30).

relaying data between said client application and said application server (Col. 5, lines 25-30; Col. 6, lines 10-20).

7. As per claim 2, Tso teaches the step of creating, in said gateway of said IP network, a directory including entries for every end-user on said IP network (Col. 6, lines 10-20; Col. 7, lines 25-30).

8. As per claims 6 and 11, claims 6 and 11 are rejected for the same reason as the rejection to claim 1 above.

9. As per claims 7 and 12, claims 7 and 12 are rejected for the same reason as the rejection to claim 2 above.

### **Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103**

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 3, 8, 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tso et al. (hereinafter Tso), US 6,421,733, in view of Aravamudan et al. (hereinafter Aravamudan), US 6,301,609.

12. As per claim 3, Tso teaches:

the step of updating, in said gateway of said network, the directory of said end-users, said step of updating the directory including the steps of:

enabling entries for those of said end-users that connect; and

updating said entries of said end-users comprising dynamic parameters whenever said parameters are changing while connected (Col. 7, lines 55-67).

In a similar, but non-identical system respecting to Tso, Aravamudan teaches

disabling entries for those of said end-users that disconnect (Col. 8, lines 1-30).

System of Aravamudan discloses of a proxy chat system where the users' online status information are stored in a remote centralized repository, this is important in a chat system to maintain user's privacy and making sure the contact list has updated information.

It would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Aravamudan and Tso because they are both dealing with a remote proxy being able to store information for the clients, furthermore, the teaching of Aravamudan to allow

disabling entries for those of said end-users that disconnect.

would improve the tracking capabilities of Tso by maintain the status of end user devices (Col. 7, line 60 – Col. 8, line 5).

It would have been obvious to combine teachings of Tso and Aravamudan in order to maintain the capability to perform certain tasks, and to better handling of incoming events.

13. As per claims 8, 13, claims 8, 13 are rejected for the same reasons as rejection to claim 3 above.

14. Claims 4, 9, 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tso et al. (hereinafter Tso), US 6,421,733, in view of Wiegel, US 6,131,163.

15. As per claim 4, Tso teaches wherein the step of retrieving parameters associated with proxy server protocol data for said first end-user includes the steps of:

obtaining leading data from said client application having issued said request for said end-user;  
parsing said leading data (Col. 6, lines 60-67);  
interrogating said directory at an entry corresponding to said first end-user;  
retrieving parameters associated with said request; and  
executing said protocol in accordance with said parameters associated with said protocol (see rejection as per claim 1 above).

In a similar but non-identical system respecting to Tso, Wiegel teaches:

determining a protocol said client application is currently using (Col. 11, lines 15-20), in order to properly process/convert the protocol to the appropriate format (Col. 11, lines 25-30);

It would have been obvious to combine teachings of Tso and Wiegel in order to maintain data integrity; properly process/convert the protocol to the appropriate format.

16. As per claims 9 and 14, claims 9 and 14 are rejected for the same reason as the rejection to claim 4 above.

17. Claims 5, 10 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tso et al. (hereinafter Tso), US 6,421,733, in view of Banavar et al. (hereinafter Banavar), US 6,662,206.

18. As per claim 5, Tso does not explicitly teach  
the step of informing said end-user of said client application that a server application is unavailable if a link to said application server is not established.

19. Banavar teaches the step of informing said end-user of said client application that a server application is unavailable if a link to said application server is not established (Col. 2, lines 27-40; Col. 1, lines 55-67; Col. 8, lines 1-10).

20. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention was made to combine the teaching of AAPA and Banavar because they both dealing with updating the status for a system through real time events occurring in the system. Furthermore, the teaching of Banavar to allow the step of informing said end-user of said client application that a server application is unavailable if a link to said application server is not established would improve the failure analysis for AAPA's system by monitoring the link in a real time basis to detect any potential link failures.

21. As per claims 10 and 15, claims 10 and 15 are rejected for the same reason as the rejection to claim 5 above.

### *Conclusion*

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reined of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however

will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

22. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The following patents and publications are cited to further show the state of the art with respect to "System and method for improving gateway transparency".


- |       |   |                    |
|-------|---|--------------------|
| i.    | US 2002/0059429   | Carpenter et al.   |
| ii.   | US 6,529,937  | Murphy, Jr. et al. |
| iii.  | US 5,740,361  | Brown.             |
| iv.   | US 6,058,480  | Brown.             |
| v.    | US 6,078,943  | Yu.                |
| vi.   | US 2003/0140153   | Lawrence.          |
| vii.  | US 6,061,692  | Thomas et al.      |
| viii. | "Address Allocation for Private Internets" RFC 1597, March 1994 |                    |
| ix.   | US 6,477,577  | Asano.             |
| x.    | US 5,699,350  | Kraslavsky.        |
| xi.   | US 5,845,255  | Mayaud.            |

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chad Zhong whose telephone number is (571)272-3946. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:15 to 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, BURGESS, GLENTON B can be reached on (571)272-3949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.



Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
**JOHN FOLLANSBEE**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100**

CZ  
April 8, 2005